

CHURCH UNION



NEWS AND VIEWS

NOVEMBER 1958

**America on Lambeth
The Plan of Union under Fire**

CHURCH UNION

NEWS AND VIEWS

(New Series)

Vol. 3 }

Organ of the Negotiating Committee for Church Union in
North India and Pkaiстан

{ No. 4

CONTENTS

	Pa
Theological Basis of Church Unity: The Ven. Archdeacon T. D. Sully ...	49
Lambeth 1958 and Christian Unity: The Rt. Revd. John Sadiq, Bishop of Nagpur	52
Unification of the Ministry: The Lambeth Comments: Very Revd. James Kellock	52
Lambeth and Unity: Review article	52
Some Comments on the Plan: Rev. K. C. Burdett	52
Absolutely Unrepeatable?: Rev. John P. Hastings	61
Book Review: Ten Years Young: Rt. Rev. S. K. Chatterji	61
The Study of the Plan	third cover

Opinions expressed in articles in *Church Union—News and Views* are those of the writers and not necessarily of the Editor or of the Negotiating Committee.

Editor: Rev. William Stewart, Serampore College, Serampore, West Bengal.

Manager: (To whom all subscriptions should be sent) Rev. Dr. W. M. Ryburn, Theological College, Saharanpur, U. P.

Subscription Rates: India and Pakistan Rs 2.00 per year.
U. K. and Europe 4s. per year.
U. S. A. and Canada 00.50 per year.

Published quarterly in February, May, August and November of each year.

Material should reach the Editor not later than 25th of the month previous to intended publication.

Subscription in U. K. and Europe may be paid through the Rev. Frank Short, Edinburgh House, 2 Eaton Gate, London S. W. 1.

Theological Basis of Church Unity*

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. DONALD SULLY

IN the brief sketch which is all I can give of a very large subject, we should naturally start from our common belief, as formulated in the Creed, in "one holy, catholic and apostolic Church". The Church is essentially one, because God has made it so and because it is the Church of the one Lord. That means that the Church is one fellowship in time, in which we are linked with all the saints of all ages, past, present and to come; it is one fellowship of Christians the world over, not divided by space or distance, nor by race or language; it is one communion of those still "militant here on earth" and of those in Paradise. Let us not forget, when we are preoccupied with the divisions of the Church, that this unity is its real character.

That unity is based on that of the God-head—the mystery of the One in Three; for our Lord prayed that "they may be one as we are one" (John 17: 22). It is a unity won and restored through the Cross where Christ has reconciled us "to God in one body" (Eph. 3: 16). And it is a unity constantly maintained and renewed by the Holy Spirit, for it is indeed "the unity of the Spirit" (Eph. 4: 3).

But the unity of Christ's Church is not to be a hidden mystery, but is to be incarnate in a visible body so as to be a witness, so 'that the world may believe' (John 17: 21). We are very conscious today that this is one of the world's greatest needs, and the Church is called to witness to the one remedy for the world's dissensions. It is to be the one Body through which the one Lord can act and till manifest Himself among men.

Each local congregation, where "two or three are gathered together in His name", is to be a local manifestation of that one Body: its unity is to be constantly renewed and deepened by the sharing in the Holy Communion—the Broken Bread and the Wine poured out. Where the Body itself appears to have been broken and so to fail in its witness, the unity should be renewed in the

sharing in the "one loaf". (I Cor. 10: 17). Thus in the Eucharist the unity is realised, is manifested, and is the ground of joy and thanksgiving.

Hence we see the sinfulness and scandal of a disunity which shows itself in division at the Lord's Table. Even where a division may seem historically to have been justified in the past, the perpetuation of the division is so clearly contrary to the purpose of the Lord and to the meaning of the Sacrament. Yet the mere coming together to one Table will be no remedy if the divisions remain unhealed. An indiscriminate partaking of the Sacrament without the "discerning of the body" (I Cor. 11: 29), and what is implied in that in the practical showing forth of a real unity, may only bring judgment.

In the early Church this unity was preserved by the ministry of the Sacrament, and particularly by the position accorded to the Bishop in relation to the one Eucharist. The maintenance of that unity came to be regarded as one of the special functions of the episcopate.

When division in the Church came, it thus came to involve both the ministry and the Sacrament. Those divided could no longer share in the one Communion or in the one ministry. But we have to recognise that there are two kinds of division. There is the schism which separates a group from the one Church and which can only be healed by that group being received back into that one Church. That seems to be the division and 're-union' which the Church of Rome can recognise, for to that Church we are but heretical sects and outside the Catholic Church. On the other hand we have come to recognise divisions within the one Church, each divided part claiming to be a part of the one Church. Hence we can speak of a "World Council of Churches"; On this view the re-union of Churches is no absorption, but a coming together with mutual recognition in a unity given anew by the Lord of the Church and the renewed gift of His Spirit.

We have to think of this unity in terms of the pattern of the visible organisation of the

* Address given at a Conference on Church Union held at the Rajpur Retreat and Study Centre, October 1958.

Church. There was no pattern laid down rigidly by our Lord when on earth. He called His Apostles, and he instituted the two Sacraments indeed; but the ordering of Sacrament, of ministry and of the fellowship had to be worked out under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and amid the risk of human error. In that working out in the early Church we can see two important factors:—

(a) There was the securing and perpetuation of the apostolic faith and practice by due succession in authority. Very soon this was challenged by the Gnostics who claimed their own secret and heretical tradition. The true faith was maintained by the great city Churches which could trace a continuity of teaching and life from their apostolic founders—Alexandria, Ephesus, Antioch or Rome. And it was maintained by the bishops of such Churches, who could similarly claim a continuity in their consecration from those whom the Lord had chosen and sent. Here is the two-fold continuity through time.

(b) There was the maintenance of a sharing in the one Catholic faith and order by means of the councils of the Church where the bishops were called together to secure by mutual consultation the unity of their local Churches. They were the representatives of their areas (or dioceses) in such ecumenical gatherings, and at the same time represented the ecumenical Church to their areas, conveying and maintaining the unity in which they had shared.

In this way the working out of a pattern of Church order, with the threefold ministry and the councils of ministers, was brought about, a pattern which came to be generally recognised in the same way as the canon of the New Testament Scriptures and the historic Creeds came to be recognised throughout the Church. These formed both the expression and the safeguards of the Church's unity. All this is not to insist that the pattern could have been worked out in this way and this way only, nor to deny the actual development in the pattern with new elements not to be grounded on any clear evidence in the New Testament or the primitive Church. And God may still have new ways and new developments in the pattern of His Church in the days to come. Yet we do well to look back at times, and to trace the continuity of our life and order as it comes

down to us through the providence of God from the early days.

That pattern of the Church and its unity was broken and in various degrees lost at various times, but particularly in the division which sprang from the Reformation, and which still have a tendency to spring up by further deviations today. It is this that makes Church unity a problem for us.

In that breaking of the traditional pattern there has been loss, but also the possibility of gain.

(a) There has been loss through the omission of elements in the pattern which may have been corrupted, yet which have a permanent value and contribution to make. And there has been loss where a much needed emphasis on some neglected belief or element in Church order has led to an over-emphasis and a lack of balance and wholeness in the life of the separated body. We are apt to criticise this loss in the other Churches, and do not so readily recognise it in our own, but we have to recognise our share in what is a real defect in the Church's life.

(b) But there is also the possibility of gain, where the divided Churches can by God's grace be brought again into a new unity. Each in its comparative isolation may have developed its special emphases and may have been given its special grace and gifts for the task to which God may have called it. These are treasures to be shared and may be used of God to bring an enrichment to the life of a re-united Church. So it was that the Committee Report of Lambeth 1930, looking forward to the union in South India, thought of it as realising a Church "within whose visible unity treasures of faith and order, nowhere in the Church at present combined, will be possessed in common, and the power of Christ will be manifest in a new richness."

Thus we can see that our striving after Church Union is in accordance with God's creative purpose, and our Lord's intention and prayer for His Church. It is a great part of our service to Him and to the world which so grievously needs His reconciling power. And it may bring to the Church through the reconciliation of our divided traditions an added richness and fulness of life, to be to His greater glory.

A PRAYER FOR UNITY

O God the Father,
 Origin of Divinity,
 Good beyond all that is good,
 Fair beyond all that is fair,
 In Whom is calmness, peace and concord ;
 Do Thou make up the dissensions which divide us from each other,
 And bring us back into a unity of love,
 Which may bear some likeness to Thy Divine Nature.
 And as Thou art above all things,
 Make us one by the unanimty of a good mind,
 That through the embrace of charity and the bonds of affection,
 We may be spiritually one,
 As well in ourselves as in each other ;
 Through that peace of Thine which maketh all things peaceful,
 And through the grace, mercy and tenderness of Thy Son, Jesus Christ,
 Amen.

—Prayer of St. Dionysius, A. D. 818, from
A Chain of Prayer across the Ages.

.....With Unabated Urgency

Never have our politicians and statesmen borne so heavy a burden or had a greater need of the spiritual resources that only the Church can provide.....

But if statesmen and politicians have failed to win unity in a divided world, where stands the Church ?

The Church stands weakened in its witness before the eyes of the world, because it is in itself torn with disunity, so that when the Church preaches reconciliation, the world turns to it and says—"Physician, heal thyself".....

And yet we stand divided, at a time when we are facing a challenge to the Christian tradition more powerful than at any period since the Dark Ages. What less than a defence of truth itself could justify the price that we are paying, and how can so tragic a situation have come about ?.....

And yet, in striving to win unity out of the wreckage and bitterness caused by 1,000 years of schism, our best endeavours are doomed if we approach our problems without the humility which forbids any assumption that man can find an answer of his own making.

Rather is it necessary to seek, with unabated urgency, to discover step by step that road along which we may journey in Christian charity one with another ; resolving to close no door, to miss no opportunity, to shun no sacrifice that will enable Christians to answer the call to 'make straight in the desert a highway for our God'.

His Grace, the Duke of Hamilton, Lord High Commissioner at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, May 1958.

Lambeth 1958 and Christian Unity

RT. REV. JOHN SADIQ, BISHOP OF NAGPUR

AMONG the five main subjects considered at Lambeth, the one concerned with Church Unity and the Church Universal has the widest ecumenical significance. For the Bishops who represented the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, it was of added importance in view of the negotiations for Church Union now going on in India, Pakistan and Ceylon.

It is proper to point out that in the official Report a distinction has to be made between the Resolutions and the Encyclical Letter on the one hand and the reports of the Committees on the other. It is only the former which express the mind of the whole Conference and therefore bear its authority and weight. The latter express the mind of the committees concerned, except where parts of them are actually adopted by the whole Conference through resolutions.

The Current of Events

Since the Conference met in 1948, many developments had taken place in the field of Church Unity. In many of these developments the Anglican Communion as a whole, or some parts of it, had been directly or indirectly involved. It will be enough for our immediate purpose to illustrate the Lambeth approach to the question of Christian unity by a few examples, and then proceed to indicate the discussion and decision with reference to the Church Union negotiations in North India/Pakistan and Ceylon.

There was much awareness of the fact that movements towards unity in different parts of the world had been manifestly blessed by God. While in 1948 the recently established Church of South India received a cautious welcome from the Conference, its full *bona fides*, particularly with regard to the validity of its Ministry, were not recognised in unmitigated terms. In 1958 the report of the Committee on Church Unity and the Church Universal speaks of at least five Churches or Provinces which have since taken steps to establish some measure of inter-communion with the Church of South India. The Committee report ends with these words, "The Committee believes that we can indeed thank God for the grace which He has bestowed

upon the bishops, presbyters, and people of the Church of South India in these past ten years, and for the response to that grace shown in the growth of inner coherence and missionary zeal. It believes that with an increased sense of assurance the words used in 1948 can be reiterated, '(We) look forward hopefully and with longing to the day when there shall be full communion between the Church of South India and the Churches of the Anglican Communion.'" The Conference endorsed the Committees's statement

Anglican-Presbyterian Relations

Relations between the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches in England and Scotland have been a matter of study for some years by representatives of these Churches. In 1957 a report on the subject was published. This gave evidence of an encouraging amount of agreement on matters relating to doctrines about the Church and the Ministry. For example, it says that "on the Presbyterian side there was a willingness to consider the functions of a bishop, as they are recognised by the Anglican Communion, so long as the office was duly integrated with the presbytery and the whole Church." On the Anglican side, there was willingness "to consider the complementing and strengthening of the episcopate in Anglican Churches by ensuring the corporate functioning of *episcopate* through developments within the existing order corresponding to the sacral courts of the Church as found within the Presbyterian order." This report is being studied on both sides. The Lambeth Committee on Church Unity and the Church Universal commenting on the Report, suggested that "there should be a continual movement of prayer, study and instruction throughout our Churches with regard to these proposals. Local conferences for the study of these matters at the congregational level should be encouraged." The Conference itself commended the report for wider study by clergy and laity throughout the Anglican Churches, and the closing resolution on the subject reads: "The Conference notes with satisfaction and thankfulness the remarkable measure of constructive theological agreement which the theologians on both

sides were able to reach and record, and expresses the hope that serious consideration may be given to the possibility of drawing the Anglican and Presbyterian traditions more closely together by a process of mutual assimilation of their respective Church Orders such as is suggested in the Report (of the Committee on Church Unity and Church Universal)".

Relations with Methodists

Conversations between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Methodist Church in America and between the Church of England and the Methodist Church in England have been going on for some years. The main emphasis of this movement in the two countries has been on intercommunion rather than on organic unity. In England early this year an interim report entitled 'Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church' was published. The Lambeth Committee on Church Unity and the Church Universal welcomed the continuance of conversations and negotiations on the express understanding:

(a) that organic union is accepted as the ultimate aim, and that this aim is kept clearly in view, and

(b) that after the establishment of intercommunion a steady process of assimilation is going on all the time, as part of the present step towards organic union, that there should be a genuine sharing of spiritual life, each Church receiving enrichment from the other Church, and that their bishops, presbyters and laity should meet together regularly in representative assembly for counsel and prayer."

The Conference calling attention to the Committee's report "encourages continuance of the conversations with a view to the making of concrete proposals, as offering a possible first step on the way to reunion in the particular historic situations in which the Churches concerned are placed; but on the understanding that organic union is definitely accepted as the final goal, and that any plans for the interim stage of intercommunion are definitely linked with provisions for steady growing together of the Churches concerned."

The last Lambeth Resolution on Church Unity and the Church Universal ends with emphasising the importance of widespread

prayer for the unity of all Christian people, and commends to all Anglicans the observance of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity and "the formation of local groups of Christians of different traditions for the purpose of promoting prayer for Christian unity."

India, Pakistan and Ceylon

I shall now attempt to describe the Conference discussions and conclusions about the *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon* and the *Plan of Church Union in North India/Pakistan*. It is important to note certain preliminary considerations:

(1) The *Scheme* in Ceylon as well as the *Plan* in North India and Pakistan differ from the proposals which culminated in the Church of South India in two important respects: (a) Both include among the negotiating bodies the Baptist Churches of the British connection. This is the first time that the Baptists are involved. (b) Both the *Scheme* and the *Plan* contemplate the unification of the Ministry at the very outset, unlike the Church of South India which has allowed a thirty-year period.

(2) The *Scheme* and the *Plan* are different from each other in one important respect, namely, that North India/Pakistan has among its negotiating members, the Methodist Church (episcopal) of the American connection. It has thus the added problem of unifying the Anglican and Methodist episcopates.

The report of the Lambeth Committee on the *Scheme* and *Plan* in North India/Pakistan is on the whole commendatory, especially with reference to the doctrine of the faith, the Church, and the Sacraments. The main difficulty which seems to have been felt was with reference to the Form of Service for unification of ministries in both and with reference to the Act of Unification of ministries in the North India/Pakistan Plan. A word may first be said about the Form of service. Recent studies in Liturgiology have revealed the fact that according to ancient tradition the more important part in a service of the consecration of a bishop or the ordination of a priest is the prayer which should mention the specific office in the Ministry and during which the hands should be laid on the candidate. It was recognised that in the existing Anglican Ordinals this order does not exist, and that future revisions of the

Prayer Book should give attention to this more primitive practice according to which the prayer has precedence over the formula which confers the authority. It was recognised that the consecration or the ordination makes the candidate a bishop or a priest in the Church of God as well as in a particular Church in accordance with the Constitution of that Church. With these in mind the Committee recommended the use of the following words in the prayer:

"For the exercise of the office (of Bishop/Presbyter) in the Church of God according to the constitution of the Church....."
or, more simply,

"In the Church of God and within the Church of....."

Urging acceptance of this suggestion and other minor modifications, the Committee recommended the Scheme in Ceylon for approval, and the Conference passed the following resolutions: "The Conference calls attention to the recommendation of the Committee on Church Unity and the Church Universal concerning the Unification of the Ministry in the Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon and advises the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon to recommend to the Negotiating Committee the suggested amendments to the Scheme.

"The Conference advises the Churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion that they should be willing to enter into full communion with the resulting Church of Lanka on its inauguration."

Difficulties about the Plan

The Plan for North India/Pakistan did not receive the same favourable treatment as the Scheme for Ceylon. The main difficulty was felt by some—and it will be correct to say that these constituted a small group—with regard to the Acts in the Unification of the Ministry. The situation may be stated very simply in this way: While in the Plan, the unification of the Anglican and Methodist episcopates is a preliminary and, in a sense, a secondary step in the Unification of the Ministry—the step in the Unification of the Ministry—the Representative Act being central and most important, the Lambeth resolution embodies the following suggestions:

(a) that the unification of the Ministry as far as it concerns the bishops should be completed in a single act, and that in this act

representative ministers from all the uniting Churches should take part in the laying-on of hands.

(b) that the next step should be the unification of the presbyterate in which the bishops, who have already been unified, need not be involved, except in that part of the ceremony where the authority is extended to them to exercise their episcopate in the Church of North India/Pakistan.

It is to be regretted that the Conference did not fully appreciate the difficulties which such a modification of the Plan would create. It may be well to point out some of these:

(1) The Plan, as it came before the Conference, was in its third and final edition and had been issued to invite the decision of the negotiating bodies. The Plan has already been translated into a number of languages, and at least one negotiating body has already given its decision in favour of the Plan. Some others are actively in the process of voting on it. At this stage to suggest modifications is to create confusion and to encourage or even provoke modifications on the part of the other bodies who have gone a long way to accommodate themselves to the proposals. It might mean going back on years of prayer and hard work.

(2) It was, I believe, not sufficiently recognised by the Conference as a whole that the most important step in the inaugural service according to the Plan is the Representative Act of Unification. This was the only way in which judgment on the Ministry of any negotiating Church could be avoided. It was left to God to supply to each Ministry whatever was lacking in it in His sight. In the present suggestion, it is difficult to avoid a judgment or even discrimination.

(3) In view of the commendatory words which the Conference has said about the doctrines of the Church and the Sacraments in the Plan, it will be difficult for non-Anglicans (and I dare say for many Anglicans) to see that the repetition of a prayer over the bishops in the course of the service of inauguration is such a serious matter as to demand the risk of jeopardising the whole Plan.

In fairness to the Lambeth Conference it may be said that it was confronted by a question which was put to it by the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon. This was in the form of a request for reasonable

assurance that, if the Plan is carried into effect, the Churches of the Anglican Communion might be expected to be in full communion with the Church in North India/Pakistan from the start. In my opinion, such a question was hardly fair in view of the fact that the Anglican Communion carries within it such a variety of opinions, including those with regard to the significance of the Church's Ministry. For example, with reference to the recognition of the Bishops and Presbyters in the Church of South India, a variety of attitudes, has come into being within the Anglican Communion. This question also in a way side-tracked the main issue—whether or not the Plan was sound and satisfactory—and concentrated attention on whether or not the Churches of the Anglican Communion could be in full communion with the new united Church. I suppose this is also a consequence of an over-emphasis on world-confessionalism with which the movement for Church unity has to contend everywhere.

Grounds for Thankfulness

With all this, one cannot but be thankful to God for the attitude of the Lambeth Conference to the subject of Christian unity, and the following words from the Encyclical

Letter referring to the Scheme in Ceylon and the Plan in North India/Pakistan are encouraging!

"We examined these schemes with the greatest care, and we would express our gratitude to God for the clear evidence of the guidance of His Holy Spirit in the negotiations, which have led to schemes of union which we believe to mark a great and significant step towards the recovery of the visible unity of the Church Universal. We believe it will be possible for the Church of Lanka to be from the outset in full communion with Churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion. With some modification, the Churches of North India and Pakistan could have the same expectation. It is the earnest hope and prayer of all our members that these unions may go forward."

While, therefore, personally I am deeply disappointed that the Plan as it stands was not commended, I do not lose hope, but earnestly believe that God's Holy Spirit Who, we believe, has brought us up to this stage, will lead us into the truth which is in Christ and to that unity which is agreeable to His blessed will. His will for the evangelisation of these lands and His will for the Unity of His people is one, and the fulfilment of that will cannot be long delayed.

Unification of the Ministry:

The Lambeth Comments

VERY REV. JAMES KELLOCK, D. D.

LAMBETH'S verdict on the Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan may be said to be one of cordial approval. It has however raised a question in connection with the Services for the Unification of the Ministries that has to be very carefully considered. It "strongly recommends that the unification of the Ministry so far as concerns the bishops should be completed in a single act, suggests that if this is done representative ministers from all the uniting Churches should take part in the laying on of hands;" and it asks: "would it be not only acceptable to the negotiating Churches but actually an increase of the significance of this piscopal unification if presbyteral representatives of all the uniting Churches thus took

part in the laying on of hands upon the bishops, sharing both in the prayers for the Holy Spirit, and in the conferring of authority to exercise the office of a bishop in the united Church?"

According to the Plan the inauguration of the union is to take place by a procedure that has five steps. These are:

(1) A service at which there shall be placed on the communion table a copy of the Plan of Union signed on behalf of the proper authorities of each Church, and signed statements of the bishops, presbyters, deacons and probationers of each Church declaring their assent to the plan of Union and acceptance of the Constitution of the Church of North India/

Pakistan, and at this service a representative of each of the uniting Churches shall read the resolution of the proper authority of his Church accepting the Plan of Union. This service is the act of union and the Presiding Minister shall in the course of it declare that the uniting Churches have become one united Church.

(2) The bringing together of the Anglican and the Methodist Episcopal episcopates.

(3) The Representative Act of Unification of the Ministry.

(4) Declaration and Confirmation of the appointment of the existing Bishops, and Consecration of new Bishops.

(5) Diocesan Services of Unification.

The Prefaces, Prayers and Formulas used in these services have to be very carefully worded so as to carry out the intention that lies behind them and so as to maintain the comprehension and mutuality that is of the essence of the Plan of Union. This intention is well summarized by Lambeth in the following passage:— "All the negotiating Churches are agreed as to the functions which are to be fulfilled through the liturgical forms proposed. They are three: 1. Negatively, the liturgical form must be such as to raise no question as to the relative sufficiency, reality, or effectiveness of the various ministries which are brought to be unified. 2. Positively, the liturgical form must be one appropriate to the essential function of seeking from God through prayer and laying-on of hands a continuance and increase of spiritual gifts already received and possessed by each minister, for the work of the Office and Order of Ministry in the Church of God to which he is now freshly called in the United Church. 3. In order that the intention of removing all ground for doubts or scruples may be fulfilled, the liturgical form must also be appropriate for its function of seeking from God that he will 'endue each according to his need' with whatever of grace, gifts, character or authority may in the sight of God be needed for the Office and Order of Ministry referred to. Thus every Church may be satisfied that all of its inheritance has been faithfully conveyed to and shared by the ministry of the United Church." (2 : 36-37)

The reason why Lambeth recommends that the unification of the Ministry so far as concerns the bishops should be completed in

a single act is that it would avoid the awkwardness of repeating for the Bishops in the course of the same service an Act which provides practically an identical prayer, and it is pointed out that "the Churches have already been united in the first part of the service whereby the separate inheritances of the uniting Churches have come together in a single stream of Church life." (2. 39) On the other hand it should be clearly understood that by the third step the Negotiating Committee intended to make explicit that it is the whole ministry of each Church that is coming together and being unified, and to ensure that the Ministries of those of the uniting Churches which hitherto exercised episcopal functions through Church Courts and individual Presbyters were accorded the agreed mutuality of recognition.

It seems to me that there is a simple solution for this difficulty which would avoid the awkwardness of having the Bishops dealt with twice in a manner that is repetitive, and which would not impair the balance of mutuality. That solution is to place the Act of bringing together the two Episcopates *after* the Preface for the Representative Act of the Unification of the Ministry, and to provide that representative Presbyters of those of the uniting Churches in which the episcopal functions have been exercised through Church Courts and individual Presbyters, take part in the laying-on of hands upon the Bishops and share in the prayers for the Holy Spirit and in the conferring of authority to exercise the office of a bishop in the united Church. The specific office of ministry could be mentioned in prayer and formula, and the phrasing "in the Church of God and within the Church of North India/Pakistan" adopted, as suggested by Lambeth. (2. 37-38).

The procedure would then be:—

Step 1, The service at which the Churches are declared to be one United Church. Step II: The bringing together of the Episcopates and the bringing together of the Presbyters. In this second step the order would be.

(i) Prefaces on p. 7 for the Representative Act of Unification.

(ii) Presentation of Bishops and reading of Preface on p. 5.

(iii) Questions and replies as on p. 8 of the Services for Inauguration.

(iv) Prayer as on pp. 5 & 6.

(v) Laying-on of hands, including resbyteral hands. The formula used should be that printed on p. 9 of the *Services for Inauguration* rather than that on p. 6, as this will better preserve the balance of mutuality and is also recommended by Lambeth (see p. 38).

(vi) Presentation of representative Presbyters of all the uniting Churches, bishops not having hands laid upon them on this occasion.

It would be desirable to amplify the directions in the section for the bringing together of the two episcopates, so as to indicate the part being taken by the representatives of the formerly non-episcopal Churches in the laying-on of hands. I would suggest that this be done by putting a comma after "Methodist communion" at the end of the second paragraph of the preface and adding "and to enable both sets of Bishops to enter into the spiritual heritage of those of the uniting

Churches that have hitherto exercised the episcopal functions through Church Courts and individual Presbyters." And at the foot of p. 5 of the *Services Proposed for Use at the Inauguration*, after "The bishops from one of the episcopal Churches shall stand before" insert "the representative Presbyters of the hitherto non-episcopal Churches and". And at the middle of p. 6, after "the bishops to be brought into one episcopate shall then kneel and the appointed bishops", insert "together with the representative Presbyters".

This whole service for making the Churches one and for unifying the Ministry of the new United Church takes place within a service of Holy Communion, and so gets its right setting. Through the Union our unity in Christ is freed from institutional restrictions, the different streams of tradition mingle to enrich one another, and, if God take not his Holy Spirit from us, the result must be a truer and more vital embodiment of Christ's purpose.

Lambeth and Unity: Review Article

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1958: *The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports.* Available from the SPCK, Post box No. 1585, Kashmere Gate, Delhi; price Rs. 5.00)

The Report of Lambeth 1958, product of the labours of over three hundred Bishops of the Anglican Churches, will be studied with profit by Christians of all denominations. Many will welcome such passages as the commendation of the use of the Bible, the positive teaching on Christian Marriage and the Home which faces frankly the need for Family Planning, the clear statement that the use of nuclear and other weapons "of indiscriminate destructive power" "is repugnant to the Christian conscience," and the repudiation of racial discrimination.

Our special interest is in the section on Church Unity and the Church Universal, though readers on this subject ought not to miss the Sections of the Report on Progress of the Anglican Communion, especially those which deal with the Ordinal (pp 2.87-90). These contain valuable comments both on the Ordinal and on the importance in ordination of so much of a "formula" as of the ordination prayer.

The Report on Unity is at once more humble, more cordial and more urgent than that of 1948. Also, while Lambeth still attaches great importance to seeking to get others to enjoy the benefits of the historic episcopate, comments both on negotiations with Methodists in England and with Presbyterians in Great Britain now clearly state that the goal to be aimed at is "nothing short of organic unity". Dare we hope that we are nearing the end of the blind alley search for "parallel episcopates" in the same territory which was suggested by the Archbishop's 1946 advice that others should "take episcopacy into their system"?

Yet the Lambeth report is disappointing. The note is less one of the sheer urgency of visible unity than of the cautious resolve to advance only by universal agreement. Unlike the 1948 Report there is no admission that there are points on which opinion is frankly divided. Statements seem to carry common consent. But this leads to obscurity in many

of them, and can allow a minority opinion to insist on more hesitancy than others might require.

It is disturbing to find that when the committee concerned wants to define what it thinks essential for the visible unity of the Church it can do not better than quote verbatim the "Lambeth Quadrilateral" in its 1920 form. Has the whole ecumenical movement of these years contained nothing to suggest to our brethren that perhaps this formula could now bear a little refashioning?

Again, few things have seemed so tragic in Church relations as the hesitancy with which Anglicanism has dealt with the Church of South India. The scruples which led some to hold back from the sacramental ministrations of presbyters who had no episcopal ordination have also dictated the limited character of Anglican recognition of the C. S. I. For those who have rejoiced to see the hand of God in the creation of that Church, and who find Lambeth today thanking Him for His grace manifest within it, it is disheartening to observe not only that Lambeth still maintains that tentative attitude, but also advises its West African Province to turn back from following the South Indian example.

The Committee voices the outright opinion that Anglican Churches "ought to be ready to recognise the Presbyterian Churches as true parts of the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and that the spiritual effectiveness of their ministerial orders ought not to be implicitly or explicitly questioned". Yet the same committee cannot recommend that Anglicans, even when settled among Presbyterians far from Anglican altars, should take Communion in a Presbyterian Church. Is not this a clear if "implicit" questioning of the recognition? We are thankful that many Anglicans do not feel themselves bound by what appears to be this official hesitancy.

When we come to the North India Plan, it is good to observe a high degree of cordiality in Lambeth's welcome of it as a whole. This gives grounds for hope that it will eventually be accepted by Anglican Churches. Yet the absence of an explicit endorsement must raise a question for the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon which must take its own decision. Certain observations may be made:

i. All the negotiating churches seek the advice of their partner churches overseas. In

the case of the Anglican churches, however what is sought is not just advice, but an answer to the anxious question of whether or not the united Church will be in communion with Lambeth. The sanction of a breach of communion was once used only for flagrant heresy. It is distressing that now it can be used in such a way as to transform legitimate counsel into serious pressure. It is to be noted, however, that while Lambeth has made some suggestions for changes with the promise that these would probably ensure intercommunion, it has not given any warning of a breach of communion if the Plan is accepted as it stands. It is for the CIPBC to take its decision in the light of this fact.

ii. Lambeth has offered to send to the CIPBC a commission of Bishops to advise them in their work. Here again, all welcome advice from other countries, but when it comes to negotiation for union, it is the Christian neighbours who know each other and who propose to live together in one Church who have the work to do. To call in experts from far and near might all too easily change our negotiations into a new "World Conference on Faith and Order", in which the urgency of a living decision can be blunted by long drawn out debate on delicate theological differences. Our unity in Christ is not built on success in such discussions.

iii. Lambeth finds the present North India proposals "confusing" and would like to see them modified so as to secure that the Bishops of the episcopal churches are first commissioned as Bishops in the united Church and then all other ministers. This is not a mere tidy-up of procedure. Much more is involved.

There is no obscurity in the present proposals so long as we are clear that the important step in the unification of the ministry is what is now "Step 3". In this step the whole ministries are unified, without any comment on their differences so as to form the ministry of the united Church. Step 2, in which the existing episcopates are "brought together" is a mere preliminary which does not provide the Church with an episcopate but simply overcomes the differences between the present two groups of Bishops. In the new Lambeth proposals asking representative ministers from all the churches to share in the "bringing together" of the episcopates, the significance of Step 3 is lost. It is no longer an event in which

sole ministry of each church is involved, it is instead a second step to deal with presbyters" only, as a separate part of the ministry, the "episcopate" having been already constituted. It is true that it is agreed that the united Church will have shops with a distinctive office and manner of appointment, but it is not true that the manner of coming together should be such as to imply priority for any one form of the ministry. The value of the form of unification Plan, whereby all ministers alike (shops and presbyters) will receive their commission through the prayer and act of the same three ministers, is jeopardised by the Lambeth suggestion.

Lambeth lays great stress on the importance of removing all ground for doubt or scruple. This is a most important matter which must apply in more than one direction. Many have felt that it is in the form which was already accepted in the third edition of the Plan that the proposals for Unification come nearest to achieving this purpose. Here we

have a form of service in which there will indeed be prayer for each and every minister that God in His mercy may grant to him all that he needs for the fulfilment of his particular ministry. This should meet the scruples of those who lay stress on the form of ordination. But here too is a form of service, in which all the ministries are presented before God, without discriminatory comment on how they were originally constituted. This alone overcomes the scruples of those who cannot consent to a judgement being passed on the different forms of ordination. It is just because the proposal seems thus to cut away ground for doubt and scruple in both directions that many have found themselves able to commend it, and it is to be hoped that, when it examines the comments that Lambeth has made, the CIPBC will take fully into consideration the danger of the introduction of fresh doubts in the attempt to satisfy those who have looked at the Plan from afar.

W. S.

Some Comments on the Plan

REV. K. C. BURDETT

OUT of the bitter sectarian controversies in the Christian Church at the beginning of the 19th century a new movement was born simultaneously in Britain and America. In America a group of churches came known as "Disciples of Christ" and in Britain, as "Churches of Christ." The leaders of this movement were impelled by intense passion for Christian Unity and were fully conscious that schism in the Church was a grievous sin and a fatal obstacle to Christian witness. Originally these men had no intention of leaving their own communions but, like so many so called "schismatics" before them, they were forced out by the spirit of intolerance so characteristic of the times.

A New Testament Basis

After much prayer and thinking they were led to the conclusion that Church Unity could not be achieved by mutual compromise but by a process of eliminating elements of disagreement until an accepted formula could be discovered. They felt that the only accept-

able basis of common agreement for all communions would be to conform to the standard of the New Testament as the sole authoritative guide to faith and practice. It was admitted that the Holy Spirit had continued to lead the Church on into further truth but there was also the conviction that such leading would not be into any form of worship, belief or practice which was in contradiction to the New Testament revelation. This would allow of diversity within the Church, and our conception of Unity has always been distinct from rigid uniformity. On this basis it was hoped that the various denominations might be led to bring their beliefs to the New Testament. Practices and doctrines which had grown up and which were not contrary to New Testament teaching and on which there was no clear Word of God would be acceptable within the United Church but where such practices were found contrary to the New Testament they should be rejected.

This attitude may be seen for example in their

approach to Baptism. Many of our pioneers were members of churches practising Infant Baptism. Study of the New Testament convinced them that baptism was administered only to believers. This they found was not simply a matter of the circumstances in which the young Church found herself nor was it a matter of a few proof texts. They believed that the whole New Testament doctrine of Baptism became meaningless if it were accorded to infants. They had therefore to reject Infant Baptism.

A hundred and fifty years of thought along these lines has resulted in a group of churches which has developed elements of both Catholic and Protestant traditions. This is hardly the place to expand this statement but, by and large, it might be said that in our doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments we have Catholic views whilst our Ministry and Polity has much in common with Protestantism.

The above introduction may serve to explain something of our joy in watching the development of the North India Union Scheme and also our difficulty in participating therein.

What of North India ?

The Editor of this journal has very graciously invited me to contribute some comments on our attitude to the Scheme and while these should not be regarded as in any sense an 'official' statement I can at least indicate a few of the ideas which are exercising the minds of our Union Committee in their consideration of this courageous step towards a United Church. I confine myself to one or two points which would cause some hesitation in committing ourselves to this Scheme.

The Ministry of the Layman

It is laid down in section VII that the Church is a "royal priesthood of believers... and that all members have the rights and duties of a priesthood". This has been a strong conviction of our churches and for that reason we have always resisted any suggestion of a distinction between the "lay" and the paid or full-time ministry. We have maintained that, subject to spiritual and intellectual qualifications, every member has the right and obligation to exercise any ministry within the Church. While this seems to be an accepted principle of the Scheme we are not altogether confident that it can be preserved in practice. Section VIII, 2 provides

opportunity for members to share in preaching and the conduct of public worship in addition to other activities in the Church but the remainder of the Scheme seems to take for granted that this will be mainly the privilege of the full-time ministers. Is this simply a matter of terminology without an essential difference in meaning when one reads that the "laity" of the Church are "separated", "appointed" and "chosen" whilst presbyters are "ordained" and bishops are "consecrated"?

The impression given by C 13 is that normally only presbyters will be expected to administer the Sacraments and D 5 does not even specify that Deacons will normally be expected to do this. Under XIV deacons may be licensed to solemnise marriages presumably under special circumstances, at the only mention of "laity" in this connection is in XIV, 15 where a few of them are called in to help over a difficulty with regard to the Marriage Act.

If for example under VIII (e) or (f) a qualified layman is appointed as an elder, would he be required to conduct worship only when a presbyter or deacon was available or would he as one of a priesthood of believers, ordained for that privilege and ministry, be expected to share in the conducting of worship with the full time ministers of the church?

To the "Free Churchman" the over-all impression given is of a Church with a full-time ordained ministry which will provide little scope for the rich contribution which our ordained lay members have made to the life of our own churches. If it be claimed that the Scheme in no way excludes such a contribution the reply may be made that it is difficult to conceive of it working out in practice in an episcopal organisation where the freedom of the local church is considerably restricted.

Church Polity

This brings us to the matter of the polity of the Church where the authority is vested in the Synod and its Court. This presents real difficulties to a church where authority is vested in the congregation as it is recognised that the New Testament lays down no definite form of church government and that the development was according to need and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We cannot therefore be dogmatic about any one form of church government and those communions which have developed a congregational form

f polity have apprehended rich values which they would be reluctant to lose. I believe our own churches would have welcomed a scheme of Union which, in its early stages at least, permitted fellowship between churches practising both Episcopal and Congregational forms of church government.

Baptism

I have already referred to the thorny problem of baptism and we are here caught in the dilemma which faces all "Baptists". Can we best contribute to the unity of the Church by saying "outside" or can we best continue our witness by indentifying ourselves with those who as sincerely believe in infant baptism? We fully appreciate that the scheme allows complete freedom for both forms but the question remains as to whether it would be possible for us to witness positively to our belief under an episcopal system.

According to Appendix B 2 the Church holds that Baptism is unrepeatable and yet, with all the toleration in the world, if he to give expression to his convictions a "baptist" minister is almost certain to convince some who were not of his persuasion

even though he does not go out of his way to make 'converts'. If he holds a deeply sacramental doctrine of baptism as a means of grace which can only be appropriated by active faith on the part of the baptised, how can he deny that means of grace to one who asks for it and what other means can he conscientiously substitute for what he believes New Testament Baptism to be? (See Appendix B 6.) To rebaptise is contrary to the tenets of the Church. Appendix B 5, 6, 7, suggest a possible "dispensation"; but even there the decision lies with the Bishop, who may be strongly and sincerely convinced that rebaptism cannot be permitted.

Limitations of space forbid me to express appreciation of so much in the Scheme which pleases and compels me to confine myself to the difficulties which we, in common with so many, have to face as we consider how far we can co-operate in these discussions. As a group of churches which have tried to make some contribution to this most important obligation of the Church we assure you that we are giving this matter our serious and prayerful thought and pray that in this new bond of fellowship the Holy Spirit may lead us into new and wider vistas of Truth.

"Absolutely Unrepeatable" ?

REV. JOHN P. HASTINGS, B. A., B. D.

A large body of Baptists are making their plea for a revision of the provisions Appendix B in the case of persons desiring "re-baptism". While it is clearly possible to estimate what proportion of paedobaptists are sympathetic to this plea, we ought not to suppose that the Baptists must fight this one out for themselves as though their particular convictions were the only ground of argument. Other besides are prepared to fight for more liberty of the individual conscience in this matter. I feel that many paedobaptist besides myself will share the feeling of this large Baptist group that the provisions are not in harmony with the generous spirit that has marked the approach to other problems confronting the united Church.

A Problem or a Challenge ?

Though I practise paedobaptism without any mental reservations. I believe that the

Baptist position too is a feasible interpretation of New Testament doctrine. Both positions are convictions arising from sincere study of the Word of God and from the guidance of the Holy Spirit. One may well ask if the Holy Spirit will guide in two conflicting ways? Yet it may be that when we cease to make exclusive claims for the priority of either position we shall see that they are not conflicting at all, that both are needed to co-exist in one Church, that the Holy Spirit actually *desires* to have both practised side by side. In the ultimate Church God may have something very different from both in store for us, but in the meantime He leads us to live, grow and work together. A writer in the *Hindustan Standard* recently argued that the Kashmir Problem was not a problem at all really, it was a challenge. This could be said even more truly about the "Re-baptism Problem"—let us face it as a challenge instead. But so long as it is determined to

adhere to a particular doctrinal point—the “unrepeatability of Baptism” in this case—as a basis for “agreement” on Baptismal practices within the united Church, there can be no real offer of fellowship.

The Rev. E. L. Wenger’s article in the May issue of ‘News & Views’ deserves the most sympathetic attention and action (except in some minor issues, as when he wants the word “Christening” substituted). Apart from its own merits in stating clearly the very real difficulties, in fact insurmountable difficulties, in which many Baptists find themselves it has I feel sure the support on other grounds too of many of us paedobaptists, not because we wish to avail ourselves of this liberty of a “re-baptism”, but because we believe that the desire for it can be real and conscientious and so in the last resort (i. e. after the Bishop’s investigation) provision ought to be made.

The Claims of Comprehension

In entering into Union we are called upon to give and to take, to share and to forgo. We cannot do this while denying that Christians from other traditions than our own have justification for their various tenets. In accepting our place in a united Church, we accept that even a practice which offends our sense of rightness is one which has been blessed by God in the experience of another tradition than our own. The provisions of the Plan indicate that, in the case of Baptism, still there is on both sides an unreadiness fully to accept the validity of the other’s point of view, and this may in fact amount to a defiance of the judgment of God on our situation. The argument of this paragraph clearly implies that.

(a) on the one hand, the dogmatic paedobaptist should not be irreconcilably averse to the “re-baptism” of one who sincerely requires it (the word “requires” is important in itself: may it not be that the person does really NEED it?);

(b) on the other hand, the Baptist minister should not feel that he can justly claim the right to refuse the administration of infant baptism. (For in entering a united Church he is recognizing the variety of practices and accepting the provisions of the Church relating to them—how can he then turn back and place his personal opinion in the way of what the Church has declared to be a blessed

means of grace and growth in the family of God? We all rightly emphasize the faith of the congregation and the importance of its promises at the time of any baptism, but no special emphasis can properly be placed on the particular beliefs of the minister administering the Sacrament. I do not say that it doesn’t matter—it matters as much as the dissentient opinion of another member sitting with the congregation—but his function is to minister, to serve, not to be master of the Church, claiming the right to deny what he will to her when she expects to receive from him.)

It seems to me that if you claim (a) you must submit to (b), and if you want other to agree to (b) you must yourself admit your duty in (a). Otherwise you are wanting to build a new Church on the old unchristian principles of denominationalism—or else are merely a victim of your upbringing. What more there is to be said in support of (b) should be expressed by one representing a Baptist tradition rather than by me; I now wish to return to (a).

A Plea for a Change

(1) First let us realise that Mr. Wenger’s position has the support of tens of millions of Christians throughout the world, taking into account denominations besides actual Baptists. Knowing that the proposals we have made regarding “re-baptism” are proving an insurmountable barrier to such a large proportion of Christians, can we fairly go on insisting the belief in the absolute “unrepeatability of baptism in the lifetime of any one person” be a pre-requisite of our fellowship together?

(2) Secondly, let us consider that insistence on this particular dogma could be a cause of future schism in the united Church, whereas to permit “re-baptism” in special circumstances would mean that so few people would ask to avail themselves of the provision as to be negligible. We are not, in so providing, changing the rule of the Church, but only providing a rider where by the harmony of mutual forbearance is preserved and assured.

(3) Thirdly, let us ask ourselves whether we who so insist on “the absolute unrepeatability of baptism” are prepared to carry out our discipline rigorously on the basis of this dogma? I know of members of non-Baptist churches (in the U. K.) who have even received more than one adult baptism.

administered at Baptist churches) without forfeiting their membership of their own church, which they continue to maintain by regular attendance and participation in that church's work and witness. Of course this is "queer" and "irregular", but who among us is prepared to propose that even though such people are in all other respects faithful to the Church's doctrine and witness, students of the Bible and examples of full Christian discipleship, they must be excommunicated because of this solitary irregularity? Certainly we will remonstrate with them, study with them, pray with them, in the hope that they will understand the good reasons why they should conform to the normal practice of their Church, but I imagine that very few of us would eject them from our fellowship through their failure to accept our advice. And we would often have to admit that this type of person has thought far more deeply about the meaning of Baptism than many others, who in spite of our instruction still bring their children for baptism merely because it is the "done thing", or, in the case of adult baptism, are baptized because it is time they were" or because of their imminent marriage.

(4) Finally I want to ask on what foundation the supposition that baptism must never be repeated is based? If it is the text of Ephesians 4, v. 5., looking at the context we find that Paul's purpose here is plainly not to assert a numerical quantity as though he were giving teaching concerning the rite but to underline the COMMONNESS to us all of the Lord, His gifts, and all Christian values and spiritual categories. In including "one baptism" is not Paul indicating the *nature* of the baptism common to us all—that is, the baptism "unto the remission of sins" (Acts 2, v. 38), not a baptism of self-justification, not the baptism of a mystery cult, not a baptism "on behalf of the dead" (I Cor. 15, v. 29), but the baptism of repentance and the cleansing from sin? So Ephesians 4, 5 is hardly logical justification for the word "therefore" in para 2 of Appendix B of the plan.

Looking at the history of the foundation of the Ephesian Church, we find an interesting thing. Paul baptized in the Name of Jesus about twelve disciples who had already been baptized into John's baptism, which Paul himself declared to be the baptism "of repentance" (Acts 19, v. 4). One would have

thought that this would have been considered sufficient a baptism, especially as John's baptism had been administered to them along with careful teaching of the things concerning Jesus (Acts 18, v. 25). What is more, it is apparent from the Gospels (an argument from silence—but there would surely have been some hint if it were otherwise?) that Jesus did not expect His disciples to be baptized again if they had already been baptized by John. According to Jesus' own teaching, and John's too, what He had to add to John's baptism was the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

The fact that at Ephesus these disciples were baptised a second time seems to me to indicate one thing—that in the *circumstances* Paul judged it to be necessary, or at least desirable, in order that the major blessing of the baptism of the Holy Spirit might be assured to them. It is futile to argue that their original baptism was invalid, because, if so, so was the baptism of the very first disciples! Alternatively if we say that Paul acted indiscreetly, and we are in a position to criticize the way in which he nurtured for years a church placed in the midst of extreme paganism? The fact that he had been responsible for beginning the Ephesian church in this way makes it quite incredible that he would later write to this and neighbouring churches the words "one baptism" with the intention that they should be understood to preclude the possibility of any one person submitting twice in his lifetime to the rite! Nor can we get anywhere conclusive with the argument that there is an intended inference by Paul that John's baptism stopped short at "repentance" but did not go on to "the remission of sins". Seeing then how Paul dealt with the circumstances as he found them, what is more natural than that we should ask our Bishops, when they have interviewed disciples beset with doubts about a past baptism yet longing to fulfil Christ's commands in every way to direct that, in order that they may gain mental calm and spiritual satisfaction and have no doubt that the Holy Spirit's baptism too is theirs, in the *circumstances* their baptism be carried out again. But it will not be another baptism making two!—it will be the same one baptism—the baptism unto the remission of sins. Nor should there be any need to pretend to de-value the earlier baptism by calling it "christening". If such devaluation has taken place in the mind of the person who has doubted, well, let it remain there—we have given him his conscience and his right.

Unwillingness to make room for the other man's conscience in this matter spells future disaster for the united Church.

I have contended that paragraphs 2 and 7 of Appendix B as they stand are neither fair, nor logical nor in harmony with the rest of the proposals for mutual 'comprehension' in our united Church, and would add my plea to the sub-Committee to consider the following suggestions:—

(1) In para 2, read "normally" instead of "therefore".

(2) In para 7, in order to clarify the mean-

ing in favour of the "liberal interpretation provide the ending—"...the minister concerned will refer the matter for pastoral advice to the Bishop of the Diocese, who if convinced that only the administration of the rite of adult baptism will give that person men and spiritual satisfaction shall direct that baptism be carried out again, under a special licence."

Whatever else baptism by water may be, may the provisions we make for its administration ensure that it be for every member true preparation for what Jesus still waits to add—that of His Holy Spirit.

Book Review

(Ten Years Young: C. L. S. Madras. Rs. 1 25 nP.)

This is the title of a booklet edited by Bishop A. M. Hollis. It contains addresses, Bible Studies and a Sermon delivered to the Synod of the Church of South India at Nagercoil in January 1958, by Bishops Sumitra, Chellappa, Jebraj, Thorp and Legg. These leaders of the Church very fittingly tried to review what the Church had been able to do and wherein they had failed during the ten years of its existence.

The Editor in his preface says "Our coming together in 1947 was an act of obedience to God's will," and that in many respects the C. S. I. has justified its existence. But in many areas "ten years have had little, if any, effect." "They did not understand what Union would mean before it happened."

Bishop Sumitra, the Moderator, in his opening address, dealt with the growth of the C. S. I. in unity. But he deplores the fact that there have been groups in the Church who have created divisions. He says that in six out of fourteen dioceses Union has not made any difference to the members. The reason according to him is that, because they have come from different denominations, they have had no chance of fellowship with those who have come from other denomination. He mentions several unifying factors viz., (1) their Theological Colleges where their ministers and laymen learn to appreciate the different traditions in the Church of God. (2) Orders of Service specially the Order of Service for the Lord's Supper (3) Women's Fellowship and the Order for Women.

Bishop Chellappa in his paper on progress of the C. S. I., "Towards an Indian Church" very frankly faces several difficulties which have retarded the progress to a certain extent. He mentions very rightly that so far as the C. S. I. is concerned the progress towards an Indian Church does not necessarily depend on the increased number of Indian

Bishops. He is of opinion that the training of ministerial leaders of the Indian Church should be of a different type. More stress should be paid to the training of the leaders in the Indian language. "Our Theology," he says, "is western and there has not been any original thinking by Indian leaders in matters of Theology." In worship there is a large room for improvement. The style of Church building and music should be of a more Indian pattern. The Liturgy of the C. S. I. has been praised by people outside because it goes back to the N. T. and the primitive church and is not a copy of western liturgy. Bishop Chellappa severely criticises their overdependence on overseas support. It is largely because of this that the Indian Church cannot make much progress. He thinks it is a very timely warning to us in the North. But in spite of all these criticisms, according to Bishop Chellappa, the C. S. I. "Every day in every year is getting better and better."

Bishop Jebaraj in his paper on Evangelism says that, although efforts are being made in this direction, the C. S. I. as a whole has not made much progress. In different dioceses some efforts are being made to strengthen the spiritual life of the Church. But some of the dioceses are still engaged in the work of integration within the church and hence have not been able to do much in the matter of Evangelism both within and outside the dioceses. Some of the dioceses are helping with men and money in the efforts of the dioceses outside. The Synod Board of Missions decided to open a foreign mission centre and sent Rev. Satya and Mrs. Joseph as their first missionaries to Papua where they did very useful work for some years. The Board decided to send another missionary couple but in the meantime Rev. Satya Joseph passed away and the Australian Government would not allow a non-European Missionary to go there. The Board received a call from Thailand to send a missionary there. Steps are being taken to send Rev. & Mrs. Paul Manickam to Thailand this year.

Bishop Thorp gave three Bible Studies and related them to the three papers viz., "How far we have grown together", "How far we have become truly an Indian Church" and "How far we have succeeded in our evangelistic task." I need not review these Bible Studies in detail but should commend them very heartily to those who would care to peruse them. They are very stimulating and we can learn much from them.

Bishop Legg preached the Synod sermon and

tried to bring all the thoughts expressed in the papers to a head in his sermon which is well worth reading. He tried to bring the Church to the realisation of the fact that we are the children of God. He based his sermon on I John 3:2 (R. S. V.).

The booklet as a whole is a very useful and timely contribution not only to the C. S. I. but to the whole Church of Christ in India.

S. K. Chatterji.

The Study of the Plan

Intensive work is going on to promote an intelligent understanding of the Plan of Union. This work is being greatly extended by the various translations which include the following:

i. Bengali, from the Christian Tract Society Book Shop, 44A Lower Circular Road, Calcutta, 16: price 37 nP.

ii. Gujarati: From the Mission Press, Surat, Bombay State: price 35 nP.

iii. Hindi: From the North India Christian Tract & Book Society, 18 Clive Road, Allahabad: price 31 nP.

iv. Marathi: From the Christian Book Shop, 84 Sankli Street, Byculla, Bombay: price 35 nP.

v. Urdu: (Indian Edition) from the Masha'l Printing Press, Kharar, Dist. Ambala, price 31 nP.

(Pakistani Edition) from the Punjab Religious Book Society, Lahore, price 4as Constitution) and 2as (Inauguration).

vi. Oriya: Summary available from the Mission Press, Cuttack, Orissa.

Among other study literature available, we commend a leaflet containing "Some Questions for Group Discussion", (price 6 nP.) available from:

The Administrative Secretary, S. C. M. House, 2 Mission Road, Bangalore.

Intended primarily for the use of Student groups, these questions are carefully framed to direct any groups of interested people to a full understanding of the Plan.

Inside India and Pakistan, study conferences are being held. News has been received especially of a three day conference organised by the Christian Retreat and Study Centre at Rajpur. An address given there by Archdeacon Sully is reprinted in this issue, and a further report of the Conference is expected for our next issue. At Nasrapur, near Poona, the study of the Plan occupied an hour daily throughout a ten day Pastors' Refresher Course held there during June 1958. A feature of this study was the insistence of those concerned that all present should use the first two hours for careful, silent reading through of the Plan itself. After that was done, discussion started and the interdenominational group eventually reached full agreement to support the Plan. The Bengal Baptists' Union has placed the study of the Plan on the programme of a week-end Retreat-Conference to be held in November.

Some bodies have given their Verdict on the Plan itself. These include the Bengal and the Malwa Church Councils of the United Church of Northern India, both of which have reported the adoption of Resolutions approving the proposals.

Change in Manager

From the end of 1958 Dr. W. M. Ryburn will cease to be manager of Church Union, News and Views. After that date, until a new Manager is appointed would subscribers kindly send subscriptions to the Masha'l Press, Kharar, Dt. Ambala Pb.

Writers in this Number

The Ven. Archdeacon Sully, leader of the representatives of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon on the Negotiating Committee, is also Secretary of the Negotiating Committee.

The Right Revd. John Sadiq is the Bishop of Nagpur in the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon.

The Very Revd. James Kellock, D.D., who has retired and now lives in the Isle of Whitehorn, Scotland, is a former Principal of Wilson College, Bombay and was at one time Moderator of the General Assembly of the United Church of Northern India.

The Rev. K. C. Burdett is a Missionary of the British Churches of Christ and is stationed at Nawa Bhandaria in Bihar.

The Rev. John P. Hastings, a Missionary of the Methodist Missionary Society, is Superintendent of the Madhupur Circuit of the Methodist Church in Bihar.

The Rt. Revd. S. K. Chatterji is the Moderator of the General Assembly of the United Church of Northern India.

Now on Sale.

The Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan

Third Edition

Price Re. 1/- per copy.

Services Proposed for use at the Inauguration of the Church of North India and the Church of Pakistan

and the Service for the Ordination of Presbyters in these United Churches

Revised 1957

Price 75 nP. per copy.

Order through your local Christian Book Shop or directly from the Publishers:

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY,

P. O. Box 501, Park Town, Madras.

For Editions in Indian Languages see note on third cover.

Printed and published at the Masha'l Printing Press, Kharar, Dist. Ambala
by A. M. Barnabas, Printer and Publisher.